

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
GREENSBORO DIVISION**

BIOMÉRIEUX, S.A., and BIOMÉRIEUX,  
INC.

Plaintiffs,

v.

HOLOGIC, INC.; GRIFOLS, S.A.; and  
GRIFOLS DIAGNOSTIC SOLUTIONS  
INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-102

**DEFENDANT GRIFOLS, S.A.’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A  
SURREPLY BRIEF IN FURTHER OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS’  
ALTERNATIVE MOTION FOR JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY**

Defendant Grifols S.A. (“GSA”) respectfully moves the Court for leave to file a very short and limited surreply brief in further opposition to the motion of Plaintiffs bioMérieux, S.A., and bioMérieux, Inc. (together, “bioMérieux”) for an order permitting jurisdictional discovery of GSA (Dkt. 33). In the surreply, GSA briefly addresses a new argument and factual issue raised for the first time in bioMérieux’s reply brief (Dkt. 47), which incorrectly asserts, as a basis for allowing the motion, that GSA agreed to produce copies of certain documents to bioMérieux. GSA seeks through the surreply to ensure that the record is clear on this newly raised point.

GSA recognizes that the Local Rules do not typically allow for a surreply brief and that the Court, other than under Rule 7.6, allows a surreply “only when fairness dictates based on new arguments raised in the previous reply.” *McKee v. City of*

*Greensboro*, 2016 WL 916414, at \*6 n.3 (M.D.N.C. Mar. 7, 2016). Because this issue was raised in bioMérieux’s reply brief, could have an impact on the outcome of the underlying motion, and could be seen to reflect on issues of integrity, GSA believes that a limited surreply is appropriate under the general fairness principles regularly cited by the Court in this context.

In addition, Local Rule 7.6 provides that “a party may assert evidentiary objections … to factual allegations contained in [the opposing party’s briefing],” and may do so by surreply when the evidentiary point is made for the first time in a reply brief. L.R. 7.6. While this issue may not fit squarely into the category of an “evidentiary objection,” the same policy underlying Local Rule 7.6 supports the filing here — that is, the nonmoving party should be given the opportunity by surreply to address factual issues raised for the first time in a reply brief. Thus, GSA believes that its surreply is also proper pursuant to the principles expressed in Local Rule 7.6.

GSA’s proposed surreply brief is attached as Exhibit 1 to this motion.

WHEREFORE, GSA respectfully requests that the Court allow it to file the short surreply attached hereto as Exhibit 1 to address a matter newly raised in bioMérieux’s reply brief.

Dated: July 3, 2017

*Of Counsel:*

Matthew M. Wolf  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: 202-942-5000  
Facsimile: 202-942-5999  
Matthew.Wolf@apks.com

David K. Barr  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: 212-836-8000  
Facsimile: 212-836-8689  
David.Barr@apks.com

Jennifer Sklenar  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
777 South Figueroa Street, 44th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: 213-243-4000  
Facsimile: 213-243-4199  
Jennifer.Sklenar@apks.com

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Allison Mullins

Allison Mullins  
N.C. State Bar No. 23430  
Stephen McDaniel Russell, Jr.  
N.C. State Bar No. 35552  
MULLINS DUNCAN HARRELL  
& RUSSELL PLLC  
300 North Greene Street, Suite 2000  
Greensboro, NC 27401  
Telephone: 336-645-3320  
Facsimile: 336-645-3330  
amullins@mullinsduncan.com  
srussell@mullinsduncan.com

*Attorneys for Grifols S.A.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system on July 3, 2017.

/s/ Allison Mullins

Allison Mullins